



DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Address: **COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS**

Washington, D.C. 20231

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.

09/327,761

99.501

APPLICATION NO.

06/07/99

PETERSEN

EXAMINER

HM22/0226

LARRY W MCKENZIE WALKER MCKENZIE & WALKER P C 6363 POPLAR AVENUE SUITE 434 MEMPHIS TN 38119-4896

FILING DATE

ARTUNITZ J PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAIGED!

02/26/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

		·
	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)
Offic Action Summary	09/327,761	PETERSEN ET AL.
	Examin r	Art Unit
	Jean C. Witz	1651
The MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on the cover sh t with the correspondence address Peri df r Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	<u> </u>	
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ Th	is action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disp sition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-4, 8, 12</u> is/are pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.		
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>2-4,8 and 12</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claims are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.		
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.		
11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved.		
12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.		
Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. \$ 119		
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. \$ 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.		
14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).		
Attachment(s)		
 15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 	19) Notice of Informal	y (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 1651

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group II, claims 2-4, 8 and 12 in Paper No.
 is acknowledged.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claim 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "including" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claims 2 and 8 recite the broad recitation "the group consisting of cellulose derivatives" and "higher molecular weight alcohols", and the claim also recites "including" a list of those cellulose derivatives and

Art Unit: 1651

higher molecular weight alcohols which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States
- 4. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Yim et al.
- 5. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by WO 9639203

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

Art Unit: 1651

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 2-4, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable (548460) over the teachings of Yim et al., O'Leary et al. and WO 9639203 taken as a whole.

The claims are drawn to compositions to be used as bone grafts which comprise calcium sulfate (particularly calcium sulfate hemihydrate), a mixing solution, a plasticizing substance and a bioactive agent, specifically demineralized bone matrix.

Yim et al. discloses formulations for delivery of osteogenic proteins. These formulations contain calcium sulfate hemihydrate combined with cellulosic materials such as claimed or polyethylene glycol or polyvinyl alcohol as claimed and further contains bone morphogenic proteins and is used as a substitute for autologous bone grafts. Yim et al. does not disclose the use of demineralized bone matrix.

O'Leary et al. disclose that demineralized bone matrix is conventionally used in bone repair in combination with glycerol. The composition may include other suitable ingredients such as bone morphogenic proteins, growth factors, therapeutic agents, and cells. O'Leary et al. does not explicitly include calcium sulfate.

WO 9639203 teach that it is conventional to produce bone graft compositions to induce bone repair by the implantation of demineralized bone matrix along with calcium sulfate and growth factors, nutrients, bone morphogenic proteins, in the presence of biocompatible excipients such as methylcellulose or hydroxymethylcellulose.

Art Unit: 1651

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to produce the claimed invention because all of the claimed components are well known to be included in bone graft compositions, within the amounts claimed. Optimization of amounts and individual components, absent objective evidence to the contrary and in view of the teaching of the conventional variability of components in the art, is deemed well within the skill of the practitioner.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean C. Witz whose telephone number is (703) 308-3073. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. M-Th and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Wityshyn can be reached on (703) 308-4743. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-4242 for regular communications and (703) 308-4242 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

đéán∕C. Witz Primary Examiner Art Unit 1651